AUSTRALIAN TAX REVIEW

Volume 37, Number 3

Aug	ust	20	80

IZI	ГТ	~)R	TΛ	T

ARTICLES

Chasing tax fraudsters using the tort of conspiracy – Peter Edmundson

This article analyses whether taxing authorities may pursue participants in tax fraud using the tort of conspiracy, with a focus on the position in Australia. A discussion of a recent successful claim in the United Kingdom is used to highlight the two main issues that arise. The first is whether or not a claim in conspiracy is legitimately available to a taxing authority and the second is whether the requirement of "unlawful means" is sufficiently broad to allow the tort to be used to combat tax fraud. These two matters are discussed in the Australian context in order to determine whether such a claim could be brought in Australia.

RAP(ping) in taxation: A review of New Zealand's Rewrite Advisory Panel and its potential for adaptation to other jurisdictions – Dr Adrian Sawyer

This article provides an in-depth narrative of the role the Rewrite Advisory Panel (RAP) has played in New Zealand's Rewrite Project, both from an outsider's perspective (the author) and from a major contributor and current Chair, the Rt Hon Sir Ivor Richardson. An important theme that emerges is the necessity for paying close attention to detail. Such detail may be overlooked in a drafting process that focuses on (re)writing in plain English according to a format promulgated by the New Zealand government in 1993. One important observation is that, without the influence of the RAP, the quality and accuracy of the Rewrite Program (including the *Income Tax Act 2007* (NZ)) would be much the poorer, with flow-on effects increasing compliance costs, creating uncertainty and invoking more judicial involvement. The importance of "rap(ping) in tax" in New Zealand therefore should not be underestimated.

\$250 deduction denial for expenses of self-education: Retention of section 82A is a mystery – Dale Boccabella

Section 82A of the *Income Tax Assessment Act 1936* (Cth) denies deductions for up to \$250 of expenses of self-education that otherwise satisfy deductibility under the general deduction section. Section 82A was introduced at the same time that \$250 dollars of expenses of self-education began to qualify as a concessional rebatable amount under s 159U. One unambiguous role of s 82A was to prevent double counting of the one cost, namely, a deduction, and a rebatable amount. The concessional rebate for expenses of self-education was repealed from 1 July 1985. However, s 82A was not repealed at the same time, even though the policy basis for its existence disappeared. The article broadly sets out the scope of operation and history of s 82A. The article then unsuccessfully searches for a credible new policy basis for s 82A. It then concludes that s 82A is inequitable, and it creates unjustifiable compliance and administrative costs. Accordingly, the existence of s 82A cannot be justified. The section should have been repealed with effect from 1 July 1985.

131

148

BOOK I	REVIEW Tax in Commo	n Law Jur	isdictions;	From the	Origins to	<i>1820</i> by l	Peter Harris	192

Guidelines for Contributors

Submission and licence agreement instructions

All contributions to the journal are welcome and should be sent, with a signed licence agreement, to the Production Editor, Australian Tax Review, Lawbook Co., PO Box 3502, Rozelle, NSW 2039 (mail), 100 Harris St, Pyrmont, NSW 2009 (courier) or by email to atrev@thomson.com.au, for forwarding to the Editor. Licence agreements can be downloaded via the internet at http://www.thomson.com.au/support/as_contributors.asp. If you submit your contribution via email, please confirm that you have printed, signed and mailed the licence agreement to the attention of the Production Editor at the mailing address noted above.

Letters to the Editor

By submitting a letter to the editor of this journal for publication, you agree that Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, trading as Lawbook Co., may edit and has the right to, and may license third parties to, reproduce in electronic form and communicate the letter.

Manuscript

Manuscript must be original, unpublished work that has not been submitted for publication elsewhere.

Personal details (name, qualifications, position) for publication and a delivery address, email address and phone number must be included with the manuscript.

Manuscript must be submitted electronically via email or on disk in Microsoft Word format.

Manuscript should not exceed 15,000 words for articles or 3,000 words for section commentary or book reviews. An abstract of 100-150 words is to be submitted with article manuscripts.

Proof pages will be sent to contributors. Authors are responsible for the accuracy of case names, citations and other references. Excessive changes to the text cannot be accommodated.

This journal complies with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC) Specifications for peer review. Each article is, prior to publication, reviewed in its entirety by a suitably qualified expert who is independent of the author.

Style

- 1. Levels of headings should be clearly indicated (no more than four levels).
- 2. Cases:

Case citation follows case name. Where a case is cited in the text, the citation should follow immediately rather than as a footnote. Give at least two and preferably all available citations, the first listed being the authorised reference.

Australian citations should appear in the following order: authorised series; Lawbook Co./ATP series; other company series (ie CCH, Butterworths); media neutral citation.

"At" references should only refer to the best available citation, eg: Mabo v Queensland [No 2] (1992) 175 CLR 1 at 34; 66 ALJR 408; 107 ALR 1.

Where only a media neutral citation is available, "at" references should be to paragraph, eg: YG v Minister for Community Services [2002] NSWCA 247 at [19].

For international cases best references only should be included. 3. Legislation should be cited as follows:

Trade Practices Act 1974 (Cth), s 51AC. The full citation should be repeated in footnotes.

4. Books should be cited as follows:

Macken JJ, O'Grady P, Sappideen C and Warburton G, The Law of Employment (5th ed, Lawbook Co., 2002) p 55.

- In footnotes do not use ibid or op cit. The following style is preferred: 4. Austin RP, "Constructive Trusts" in Finn PD (ed), Essays in Equity (Law Book Co, 1985).
- Austin, n 4, p 56.
- 5. Journals should be cited as follows:

Odgers S, "Police Interrogation: A Decade of Legal Development" (1990) 14 Crim LJ 220.

Wherever possible use official abbreviations not the full name for journal titles.

- In footnotes do not use ibid or op cit. The following style is preferred:
 6. Sheehy EA, Stubbs J and Tolmie J, "Defending Battered Women on Trial: The Battered Woman Syndrome and its Limitations" (1992) 16 Crim LJ 220.
- 7. Sheehy et al, n 6 at 221.
- 6. Internet references should be cited as follows:

Ricketson S, The Law of Intellectual Property: Copyright, Designs and Confidential Information (Lawbook Co., subscription service) at [16.340], http://subscriber.lawbookco.com.au viewed 25 June 2002. Underline the URL and include the date the document was viewed.

For further information visit http://www.thomson.com.au/legal/ or contact the Production Editor.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The Australian Tax Review comprises four parts a year.

Customer service and sales inquiries:
Tel: 1300 304 195 Fax: 1300 304 196
Web: www.thomson.com.au/legal/p index.asp
Email: LRA.Service@thomson.com

Editorial inquiries: Tel: (02) 8587 7000

HEAD OFFICE 100 Harris Street PYRMONT NSW 2009 Tel: (02) 8587 7000 Fax: (02) 8587 7100



© Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited ABN 64 058 914 668 trading as Lawbook Co.

ISSN 0311-094X

Typeset by Lawbook Co., Pyrmont, NSW

Printed by Ligare Pty Ltd, Riverwood, NSW